



भारत का दावापत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

लॉ 9]

नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, मार्च 21, 1987/फालगुन 30, 1908

No. 9]

NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, MARCH 21, 1987/PHALGUNA 30, 1908

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में
रखा जा सके।

**Separate Paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a
separate compilation**

भाग II—खण्ड 3—उप-खण्ड (iii)
PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (iii)

(संघ राज्य के अधिकारियों को छोड़कर) केन्द्रीय अधिकारियों द्वारा जारी किए गए आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं
Orders and Notifications issued by Central Authorities (other than Administrations of Union Territories)

भारत निर्वाचन आयोग

नई दिल्ली, 27 फरवरी, 1987

आ. नं. 38.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1950
(1950 का 43) की धारा 13 ख की उप-धारा (1) के उपवच्चों के
अनुसरण में भारत निर्वाचन आयोग निवेश देता है कि इसकी तारीख 16
सितम्बर, 1983 की अधिसूचना सं. 429 दिल्ली/83 में निम्नलिखित
और संशोधन किए जाएंगे अर्थात्:—

उक्त अधिसूचना से संलग्न सारणी के स्तम्भ 2 में क्रम संख्या 2
पर विद्यमान प्रविष्टियों 2 दक्षिण दिल्ली उप खण्ड मजिस्ट्रेट (पंजाबी
बाग) न्यू कोर्टस बिल्डिंग, तीस हजारी दिल्ली” तथा 3-वाह्य दिल्ली “एल. ए. सी. मैहरौली, उपायुक्त का कार्यालय न्यू कोर्टस बिल्डिंग,
तीस हजारी दिल्ली” के स्थान पर

“2—दक्षिण दिल्ली

उप खण्ड मैजिस्ट्रेट (दक्षिण)

न्यू कोर्टस बिल्डिंग

तीस हजारी दिल्ली।

तथा 3-वाह्य दिल्ली

उप-खण्ड मैजिस्ट्रेट पंजाबी बाग

ओ. आई. सी. (विज)

न्यू कोर्टस बिल्डिंग,

तीस हजारी दिल्ली”

प्रविष्टियां प्रतिस्थापित की जाएंगी।

[नं. 429/दिल्ली/87]

आदेश से,

सूरज प्रकाश, अवर सचिव

ELECTION COMMISSION OF INDIA

New Delhi, the 27th February, 1987

O.N. 38.—In pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (1) of section 13B of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), the Election Commission hereby directs that the following further amendment shall be made in its notification No. 429/DL/83 dated the 16th September, 1983, namely :—

In column 2 of the table appended to the said notification for the existing entries against serial Nos. 2-South Delhi—Sub-Divisional Magistrate, (Punjabi Bagh), New Courts Building, Tis Hazari, Delhi” and 3-Outer Delhi—L.A.C. Mahruli, Deputy Commissioner’s Office, New Courts Building, Tis Hazari, Delhi”, the entries,

“2—South Delhi—Sub-Divisional Magistrate (South), New Courts Building, Tis Hazari, Delhi;

and 3—Outer Delhi—Sub-Divisional Magistrate, Punjabi Bagh/OIC(Vig), New Courts Building, Tis Hazari, Delhi”.

shall be substituted.

[No. 429/DL/87]

By order,

SURAJ PARKASH, Under Secy.

नई नियमी, 4 मार्च, 1987

आ. अ. 39.—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व अधिनियम, 1951 (1951 का 43) की धारा 106 के अनुसरण में, निवाचन आयोग 1985 की निवाचन घर्जी मंज्याम् 3 और 5 में आनंद प्रदेश उच्च न्यायालय के तारीख 2 सितम्बर, 1986 के निर्णय को गतद्वारा प्रकाशित करता है।

[म. 82 /आ. अ /3/85]

दिनांक दि.

ट. सी. सिंहल, अवार सचिव

New Delhi, the 4th March, 1987

O.N. 39.—In pursuance of section 106 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (43 of 1951) the Election Commission hereby publishes the Judgment pronounced on 2nd December, 1986 by the High Court Andhra Pradesh in Election Petition Nos. 3 and 5 of 1985.

[No. 82/AP-HP/3/85]

By Order,

T. C. SINGHAL, Under Secy.
IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA
PRADESH AT HYDERABAD

Tuesday the Second day of December one thousand nine hundred and eight six.

PRESENT :

The Hon'ble Mr. Justice Jayachandra Reddy.

Election Petition Nos. 3 and of 1985

E.P. No. 3 of 1985

BETWEEN

Rajagopal Rao, Bodapalli.

.. Petitioner.

AND

1. Appayya Dora Hanumanthu.
2. Bompalli Ramanna.
3. Motta Jagughatlu.
4. N.S.N. Reddy.
5. Nandamuri Taraka Rama Rao.
6. The Director of Information & Public Relations, Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad.
7. The State of Andhra Pradesh, rep. by its Chief Secretary, Secretariat Buildings, Hyderabad.
8. The Election Commission of India rep. by its Chief Election Commissioner, New Delhi.
9. The Returning Officer, Srikakulam Parliamentary Constituency and the District Collector, Srikakulam, Andhra Pradesh .. Respondent.

The name of the 5th respondent is struck off as per the application No. 187/85 by court order dt. 13-9-85 the names of the respondents 6, 7 and 9 are struck off by court order dt. 20-9-85 in Application No. 221/85.

The respondent No. 8 is given up by order dt. 19-7-85 vide endorsement of the Advocate.

Election Petition under sections 80, 80A and 81 of the Representation of the people Act of 1951 praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to allow the Election Petition;

- (a) Declaring the election of the 1st respondent herein to the said Srikakulam No. 1 Parliamentary constituency is void;
- (b) Declaring the petitioner has been duly elected from the Srikakulam No. 1 Parliamentary constituency in the said election;

(c) Making an order making Mr. N. T. Rama Rao and respondent No. 1 have committed corrupt practices under section 123(1), 123(3A) and 123(7) of the Representation of the People Act of 1951 and

(d) Directing the respondents herein to pay the costs of this petition.

Election Petition No. 5 of 1985 :—

BETWEEN

Chintada Adinarayana.

Petitioner.

AND

1. Appayya Dora Hanumanthu.
2. Nandamuri Taraka Rama Rao.
3. The Election Commissioner of India rep. by Chief Election Commissioner, New Delhi.
4. The Returning Officer, Srikakulam No. 1, Parliamentary Constituency and the District Collector, Srikakulam, A. P. .. Respondents.

The name of the 2nd respondent is struck off by court order dt. 13-9-85 in application No. 188/85.

The respondent No. 3 is given up by order dt. 19-7-85 vide endorsement of the Advocate dt. 19-7-85.

The name of the 4th respondent is struck off by court order dt. 20-9-85 in application No. 222/85.

Election Petition under sections 80, 80-A and 81 of the Representation of the People Act of 1951 praying that in the circumstances stated in the affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to allow the election petition;

- (a) Declaring the election of the 1st respondent herein to the said Srikakulam No. 1 Parliamentary constituency is void;
- (b) Making an order naming Mr. N. T. Rama Rao and the respondent No. 1 have committed corrupt practices under section 123(1), 123(3A) and 123(7) of the representation of the people Act of 1951; and
- (c) Declaring the respondent herein to pay the costs of this petition.

FOR THE PETITIONER IN E.P. NO. 3/85, MR. K. R. K. VARAPRASAD RAO, ADVOCATE.

FOR THE PETITIONER IN E.P. NO. 5/85, MR. K. RAMANUJACHARY, ADVOCATE.

FOR THE RESPONDENT NO. 1 IN BOTH E. PS., MR. E. AYYAPA REDDY, ADVOCATE.

FOR THE RESPONDENT NOS. 2 TO 4 IN E.P. NO. 3/85, NOT APPEARING IN PERSON OR BY ADVOCATE.

The Court made the following :—

JUDGMENT

These two election petitions are filed questioning the election of Sri Hanumanthu Appayya Rora (1st respondent) as a Member of the Parliament from Srikakulam No. 1 Parliamentary Constituency in the 8th General Elections for the House of the People. The polling date of the election was on 27-12-1984, but the poll was countermanded and the date of polling was fixed on 28-1-1985. The petitioner in Election Petition No. 3 of 1985, viz., Sri Boddepalli Rajagopal Rao, contested as the Congress-I candidate. The 1st respondent contested as Telugu Desams Party candidate. Apart from these two, there are three more candidates. The election took place on 28-1-1985 and the 1st respondent was the returned candidate and was declared elected. One of the voters has filed Election Petition No. 5 of 1985 while E.P. 3 of 85 is filed by the unsuccessful Congress-I candidate.

In both these election petitions the election of the 1st respondent is questioned mainly on the ground that Sri. N. T. Rama Rao, the Chief Minister as well as Telugu Desam Party President, gave speeches and also got advertisements published in the newspapers making some promises as evidenced by some of the Annexure to the election petitions and that the same amounted to corrupt practices and therefore the election has to be set aside. It is also prayed that Sri N. T. Rama Rao as well as the 1st respondent should be named under section 99 of the Representation of the People Act. Pending further trial of the election petitions, an application (86 of 1986) was filed by the petitioner in E.P. 3 of 85 to issue notice to Sri N. T. Rama Rao under sec. 99 on the ground that the evidence adduced so far shows that Sri N. T. Rama Rao committed corrupt practices. That petition was dismissed holding that the petition is rather premature.

On the basis of the election petitions and the counter filed by the respondents, the following Issues were settled for trial :—

1. Whether the activities of the party in the Constituency are the activities of the candidate when the candidate is contesting on that party ticket ?
2. Whether the Annexures I, II and III form part of Election Programme ?
3. In what capacity Sri. N. T. Rama Rao made the Annexures I, II and III caused to be advertised through Governmental Agency and for the furtherance of the prospects of Telugu Desam and its candidates ?
4. Whether the five lakh voters are covered by the Green cards ? If not so, how many votes are covered by green cards ?
5. Whether Annexures IV and V are caused to be published by Sri N. T. Rama Rao in view of the election and for the furtherance of the prospects of Telugu Desam candidate ?
6. Whether Sri N. T. Rama Rao has committed corrupt practices under sec. 123 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 ?
7. With reference to Annexure IV and V as alleged in the election petition, whether the 1st respondent is equally guilty of the corrupt practices as that of Mr. N. T. Rama Rao ? If so, to what length the 1st respondent is responsible ?
8. Whether the 1st respondent and Mr. N. T. Rama Rao gave speeches about the Annexures in the election tour in Srikakulam Constituency ?
9. Whether the 1st respondent and Mr. N. T. Rama Rao have committed corrupt practices under secs. 123(1), 123(3-A) and 123(7) of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 by attending the election meetings and giving speeches with reference to all the Annexures ?
10. Had not Annexures I, II, III, IV and V been there what would be the probable election results in view of the green card holders ?
11. Whether the first respondent and Mr. N. T. Rama Rao should be declared to have committed corrupt practices under sec. 123 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 ?
12. Whether the election of the 1st respondent can be set aside by declaring as void ?
13. Whether the petitioner can be declared to have been duly elected under the Representation of the People Act, 1951 ?
14. To what relief ?

The evidence adduced in E.P. 3 of 1985 was agreed to be treated as evidence in E.P. 5 of 1985 also. On behalf of the petitioners P.Ws. 1 to 12 were examined and the

1st respondent himself got examined as R.W. 1. The other candidates who were included as respondents remained ex parte.

Originally Sri N. T. Rama Rao as well as the Director of Information & Public Relations, Andhra Pradesh also were made parties, but their names were struck off as they were not considered to be necessary parties. Though there are number of issues, the bone of contention of the learned counsel in both the election petitions is that when a person is contesting on a party ticket and on a party symbol the activities of the party in the constituency are to be treated as the activities of the candidate himself and that Sri N. T. Rama Rao has given advertisements published in Visalandhra, Enadu and Andhra Jyothi and for the said advertisements he has used the Government machinery for the furtherance of the prospects of Telugu Desam Party, and the same amounts to corrupt practice. It is also submitted that Sri N. T. Rama Rao as well as the 1st respondent addressed meetings at several places during the tour of the constituency by Shri N. T. Rama Rao and that in every meeting Sri N. T. Rama Rao spoke about those advertisements and their contents which are marked as Annexures and the same amount to corrupt practice and therefore the election has to be set aside. It is further contended that the contents of these advertisements go to show that Mr. N. T. Rama Rao as the Chief Minister and as the President of Telugu Desam Party had made promises and also announced that certain gifts have been given to the poorer sections. It is also submitted that by specifying that these benefits are meant only for poorer classes and that they should vote for Telugu Desam Party. Mr. N. T. Rama Rao has brought out a class hatred between the poor and the rich.

The learned counsel for the first respondent on the other hand, submits that a leader of a political party is entitled to declare to the public the policies of the party and ask the electoral to vote for his party and such declarations would not amount to undue influence and corrupt practices.

To appreciate the rival contentions it is necessary at this stage to refer to the contents of these advertisements which are marked as Annexures, and the evidence of the witnesses. In both the Election Petition Exs. P.1 to P.11 are marked. The concentration has been on the contents of Ex. P.1 to P.3 Ex. P.1 is an advertisement issued by the Director of Information & Public Relations. It contains the photo of Sri N. T. Rama Rao and reads that "he conveys his greetings for the new year and that the families, whose annual income is Rs. 6,000 or less, are entitled to green cards". P.2 is again a similar advertisement highlighting the supply of rice at Rs. 2 per K.G., and sarees and Dhoties at subsidised rates, to green-card holders. Some of the contents of Ex. P.3 on which much reliance is placed reads thus :—

Olkilandhra praa jeevitamlo ee sankarnti sarakotta kan-tulu nimpalani korutu prabhutva pedaprajalaku andinche subha kanuka.

Tiradaniki tindi, kattukotaniki batta undadaniki illu veve prani, nanishi jeevitaniki kavalasina kanisa avasaralu.

Tattistunnadi prabhutvm pedalakosam pakka illul.

Tattistunnadi pedavariki 2 Rs. kilo biyyam.

Amalu parustunnadi maro padhakari, sagam dharake cheeraalu, dhovatulu, pedavargalalo pampini.

*** *** *** *** ***

Vakupachha card unnavarike ee pudhakam vartisinttdi.

The advertisement further reads that the Government is constructing houses for the poor, supplying rice at Rs. 2/- per K.G. for the poor and implementing another scheme, viz., supply of sarees and Dhoties at subsidised rates and that these schemes are intended only to the poor people who are green-card holders. The contention relating to Ex. P.3 is that these are all gifts and promises made by Sri N. T. Rama Rao who is the President of Telugu Desam party and also the Chief Minister, and that the same amounts to bribery. Ex. P.4 is a G.O. (Ms. No. 511, dated 28-11-84) issued by the Education Department sanctioning the opening of Junior Colleges at several places mentioned in the Annexure thereto. The three places with which we

are concerned, are Thogaram, Kothabommali and Ranasamai in Srikrakulam District. Ex. P.5 is another G.O. (No. 509, dated 28-11-1984) issued by the Education Department sanctioning Degree Colleges at several places in the State. Amadalavalasa is one of the places mentioned in the Annexure to the G.O. Ex. P.6 is a letter dated 30-6-82, addressed to the petitioner by Sri B. Venkatram, the then Chief Minister, which says that the Chief Minister had already asked the Education Minister to take necessary action about the application of the Amadalavalasa Educational Society for starting a Government Degree College. Ex. P.7 is another letter written by Sri N. T. Rama Rao, the present Chief Minister to the petitioner regarding the starting of a Degree College at Amadalavalasa. Ex. P.8 also is another letter regarding the Degree College at Amadalavalasa. Ex. P.9 is a letter dated 3-3-1982 from the District Panchayat Officer, Srikrakulam, to the petitioner regarding the starting of the College at Amadalavalasa. Exs. P.6 to P.9 are filed only to show that the starting of a Degree College at Amadalavalasa was already under consideration even before Sri N. T. Rama Rao became the Chief Minister and that Shri N.T. Rama Rao, by issuing the G.O.s in Exs P.4 & P.5 has misled the people. Ex. P.10 is a calendar for the year 1985 issued by the Telugu Desam party with the party symbol, viz., cycle, and each page contains the photo of Sri N. T. Rama Rao in different poses and also mentions about the schemes taken up by the Telugu Desam party which include mid-day meal, sarees and Dhoties at half-rates, giving free rickshaws, etc. Ex. P.11 is only a Telex message containing the tour programme of Sri N. T. Rama Rao in Srikrakulam District.

Now, I shall briefly refer to the oral evidence P.W. 1 is the petitioner Sri B. Rajagopala Rao. He deposed that he contested as the Congress-I party candidate and that the 1st respondent contested as Telugu Desam party candidate. Exs. P.1 to P.11 are marked through him and he has given all the details of the contents of these Exhibits. He also admitted that in Ex. P.3 it is mentioned at the end that people's welfare is the aim of the Government which is dedicated to the people. The witness added that distribution of sarees and Dhoties which commenced on 26-1-1985, was only for the purpose of the Parliamentary election and the mention in Ex. P.3 that giving sarees and Dhoties at subsidised price was a gift for Sankranthi, is false as Sankranthi was already over. The witness has also deposed about the starting of a Degree College at Amadalavalasa and that even as early as 30-6-1982 the then Chief Minister promised to look into the matter and the Amadalavalasa Panchayat also passed a resolution to donate a sum of Rs. one lakh, and that the issuance of the G.Os. Exs. P.4 and P.5 is only to brighten the prospects of the Telugu Desam party. He was also cross-examined.

P.W. 2 is the President of Tekkali Panchayat Samithi. He deposed as to what happened on 22-1-1985 in the public meeting at Tekkali. He stated that in that meeting the 1st respondent spoke saying that Sri N. T. Rama Rao is "Apara Sreeramachandra Murthy", who will solve the problems of the poor people and therefore all of them should vote for the Telugu Desam party. Afterwards Sri N. T. Rama Rao addressed the gathering saying that all young sisters and young brothers and all poor people are his people and that he has taken up the scheme of supplying rice at Rs. 2 per Kg. and that all the people whose income is less than Rs. 6,000 are his people and they are entitled to green cards and therefore all green-card holders are his people.

P.W. 3 is a resident of Kotabommali. He deposed about the meeting that was held at Kotabommali. His evidence also is to the same effect as that of P.W.2. P.W.4 is a resident of Amadalavalasa. He also deposed that there was a meeting at Amadalavalasa and that the gathering was addressed by the 1st respondent as well as N. T. Rama Rao. His evidence also is on the same lines as that of P.W.2. P.W. 5 is a resident of Narasannapet. P.W.6 is a resident of Harischandrapuram. P.W.7 is a resident of Itchapuram and P.W. 8 is a resident of Gera near Kalingapatnam. These witnesses deposed about the meetings that were held in those places and the contents of the speeches delivered by the 1st respondent and Sri N. T. Rama Rao. They have all deposed that both of them highlighted about the various themes and that Sri N. T. Rama Rao told the gathering

that his party is for the poor people and all the people whose income is below Rs. 6,000 per annum, are entitled to green-cards and they are all his people.

P.W.9 belongs to the Information Department. He stated that on behalf of the Government the Information Department gives the advertisements to the newspapers and that the Chief Minister holds the portfolio of the Information Department also. He, however, stated that he cannot say how the Director issues the advertisements and as per whose instructions. P.W.10 is the District Supply Officer, Srikrakulam. He is only a formal witness and he deposed that the 1st respondent was declared elected during the elections. P.W.11 is the Director of Information and Public Relations Department. He deposed that his Department gives advertisements to newspapers and other media. Whenever, the Government issues a G.O. regarding any scheme or programme, a copy of it is also marked to the Information Department and on the basis of the G.O. the department will prepare the necessary advertisement and publish in the newspapers the necessary advertisement and publish in the newspapers and other media. He asserted that the advertisements are issued as per the directions of the Commissioner. P.W.12 is Sri P.V.R.K. Prasad, who at the relevant time worked as the Commissioner for Information and Secretary to the Government of Andhra Pradesh. He admitted that he was the Head of the Department and was also the Commissioner for Information and Cultural Affairs. He stated that the block regarding Ex. P.1 advertisement was prepared by the newspapers themselves and the same was not prepared by the Government, and that the photo of Sri N. T. Rama Rao is published as per the instructions given by the Department. Likewise he has stated about Exs. P.2 and P.9 also. He denied the suggestion that the words "to you" in Ex. P.1 are only referable to green-card holders. In the cross-examination he asserted that the Director of Information and Public Relations during his regime did not issue any advertisements depicting Sri N.T. Rama Rao as Semi-God. In the further cross-examination he stated that these advertisements were not given as per the personal instructions of Sri N. T. Rama Rao.

On behalf of the respondents only the 1st respondent was examined as R.W. 1. He deposed that he was practising as an advocate and that he contested as a candidate and got elected. He also admitted that he & Sri N.T. Rama Rao addressed meetings at Kotabommali, Tekkali, Amadalavalasa and other places.. In the cross-examination he asserted that the advertisements were not given by Sri N. T. Rama Rao in the capacity as Chief Minister. He also said that it is false to say that Sri N. T. Rama Rao was worshipped by some people at Palasa. He said that the words "Navaratri" do not refer to those whose income is less than Rs. 6,000/- only.

Referring mainly to the contents of Exs. P1 to P.3 and the evidence of P.Ws.1 to 12, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that Sri N. T. Rama Rao who at the relevant time was the President of the Telugu Desam party and also the Chief Minister, used the Government machinery and the advertisements go to show that he gave "gifts" to the voters to attract their votes and the same amounted to bribery. Strong reliance is placed on the contents of Ex. P.3 which are extracted above. It is submitted that the word "Kanuka" in Ex. P.3 only means "gift" and therefore the act of the Chief Minister comes within the meaning of bribery. It must be noted that what is stated in Ex. P.3 is that rice is being supplied at a lower rate and small houses are being constructed to poorer sections and that clothes are being supplied at subsidised rates and these are all "Sankranthi gifts" to the poor people by the Government. The question is whether such promises by a political party which is in power, amount to bribery or corrupt practices. The learned counsel could not place any authority in support of his submission. It is a matter of common knowledge that a leader of a political party is entitled to declare the policies of his party and ask the electorate to vote for his party. In Harij Singh Vs. Umrao Singh A.I.R. 980 SC. 701 it is observed thus :—

"If was necessary for the purpose of proving the corrupt practice of bribery to establish that there was an element of "bargaining" in what the respondent is alleged to have done for Baba Pird and Littran.

If a Minister redresses the grievances of a class of the public or people of a locality or renders them any help, on the eve of an election, it is not a corrupt practice unless he obtains promises from the voters in return, as a condition for his help. It was also held that the "evidence must show clearly that the promise or gift directly or indirectly was made to an elector to vote or refrain from voting at an election."

It must also be noted that the Directive Principles of the State Policy which are enshrined in the Constitution themselves provide for taking up welfare measures to promote the cause of the poor and weaker sections of the people. Therefore, there is nothing wrong if a political party highlights their election programme, their achievements and their future programme, and I have no hesitation in holding that a political party which is in power does not commit a corrupt practice merely by declaring its policy by highlighting the achievements and also future programme.

E.P.5 of 1985.—As already mentioned, the evidence adduced in Election Petition No. 3 of 1985 was agreed to be treated as evidence in E.P. 5 of 1985 also. However, in Election Petition No. 5 of 1985 the petitioner, viz., the voter, got himself examined as P.W.1 and no other witnesses were examined. His evidence also is about the visits of Mr. N. T. Rama Rao and the meetings held in that constituency. Though Exs. P.1 to P.17 were marked through him, reliance is however, placed only on Exs. P.1 to P.3 which are common in both the election petitions. No. separate arguments are advanced in Election Petition No. 5 of 1985. Therefore, it is not necessary to refer to the documents marked in this election petition separately. The arguments advanced in E.P.3 of 1985 are adopted in this election petition also.

In the result, both the election petitions are dismissed with costs (one set) in E.P.3 of 1985. Advocate's fee Rs. 500.

E.P. No. 3 of 1985

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE

WITNESSES EXAMINED

For petitioner :

1. B. Rajagopal Rao
2. Satturu Loka Nadham
3. K.A.N. Bhukta
4. Paidi Sreeramamurthy
5. Surapu Suryaprasada Rao
6. Simma Kami Naidu
7. Mohd. Shamshuddin Yazdan
8. M. Rama Rao
9. B. V. Rama Rao
10. G. Appa Rao
11. C. V. Narasimha Reddy
12. P.V.R.K. Prasad.

For respondents :

1. H. Appayya Dora

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For Petitioner :

- Ex. P.1 2-1-85 New year greetings' advertisement issued by DIPR. (Visalandhra).
- Ex. P.2 3-1-85 Advertisement issued by DIPR in Eenadu daily.
- Ex. P.3 17-1-85 Advertisement in Andra Jyothi daily issued by DIPR.
- Ex. P.4 28-11-84 G.O. Ms. No. 511, Education (J) Dept.
- Ex. P.5 28-11-84 G.O.Ms. No. 509, Education (J) Dept.

Ex. P.6 30-6-82 Lr. from the Chief Minister (Sri Bhavanam Venkatram) reg. starting of a Govt. Degree College at Amadalavalasa.

Ex. P.7 -6-83 Lr. No. 3100/CMP/1983 of Sri N. T. Rama Rao, Chief Minister reg. repairs of cut outs of river Vamsadhara and reg. sanction of Degree College at Amadalavalasa.

Ex. P.8 -5-83 Lr. No. 2639/CMP/1983 of Sri N.T. Rama Rao, Chief Minister reg. sanction of Degree College, Amadalavalasa.

Ex. P.9 3-3-82 Lr. Rc. No. 7531/81. P4 of the Distt. Panchayat Officer, Srikakulam reg. contribution by Amadalavalasa Panchayat to the Degree college.

Ex. P.10 Calendar for the year 1985 issued by Telugu Desam Party.

Ex. P.11 17-1-85 Telegraphic message regarding the tour programme of Sri N.T. Rama Rao, Chief Minister in Srikakulam Distt. sent by P.S. to C.M., Hyderabad to the Collector and Supdt. of Police, Srikakulam.

For respondents—NIL.

E.P. No. 5 of 1985

APPENDIX OF EVIDENCE

WITNESSES EXAMINED

For petitioner :

1. Chintade Adinarayana

For respondent : NIL

DOCUMENTS MARKED

For petitioner :

- Ex.P.1 24-1-85 Advertisement in Andhra Jyothi daily issued by DIPR.
- Ex.P.2 22-1-85 News paper advertisement in Andhra Jyothi daily issued by DIPR.
- Ex.P.3 11-1-85 Newspaper advertisement in Andhra Jyothi daily issued by DIPR.
- Ex.P.4 21-1-85 Newspaper advertisement issued by DIPR in Andhra Jyothi daily.
- Ex.P.5 3-1-85 Newspaper advertisement issued by DIPR in Eenadu daily.
- Ex.P.6 17-1-85 Newspaper advertisement issued by DIPR in Andhra Jyothi daily.
- Ex.P.7 9-1-85 Newspaper advertisement issued by DIPR in Andhra Prabha daily.
- Ex.P.8 9-1-85 Newspaper advertisement issued by DIPR in Andhra Jyoti daily.
- Ex.P.9 Sign board with Sri N.T. Rama Rao in Safron cloths and with cycle marks with a message that Telugu Desam is calling and to vote for Cycle symbol.
- Ex.P.10 A badge given in voters' houses.
- Ex.P.11 Card distributed in voters' houses with the photo of Sri N.T. Rama Rao, Chief Minister.
- Ex.P.12 Card containing the photo of Sri N. T. Rama Rao, Chief Minister requesting the public to vote to cycle.
- Ex.P.13 Calendar for the year 1985 issued by Telugu Desam party.

Ex.P.14(a)	C.C. showing the information reg. the voters., strength ballot papers supplied polling Boothwise etc.	
Ex.P.14(b)	—do—	
Ex.P.14(c)	—do—	
Ex.P.14(d)	—do—	
Ex.P.14(e)	—do—	
Ex.P.14(f)	—do—	
Ex.P.15	4-3-85	Advertisement in Andhra Prabha daily issued by Congress-I Party.
Ex.P.16	4-3-85	Advertisement in Andhra Prabha daily issued by Congress-I Party.
Ex.P.17	24-2-85	Newspaper advertisement in Hind in daily issued by Congress-I Party.

For respondents:— NIL

Sd/- J KRISHAN SARMA
DEPUTY REGISTRAR
For ASST. REGISTRAR

मई विली, 5 मार्च, 1987

गुरुदि-पत्र

सा. प्र. 40—लोक प्रतिनिधित्व प्रबिधियम, 1950
(1950 का 43) को भारा 13क के अन्तर्गत जारी की गई भाष्यां की

प्रधिसूचना में 154/रज./87, दिनांक 23 जनवरी, 1987 में
विद्यमान प्रविधि “श्री धर्मसिंह मीना, श्री. ए. एस., सचिव, राजस्थान
सरकार, खान अधिक, बन तथा पर्यावरण विभाग” में गुरुदि करके उसे
“श्री धर्म सिंह मीना, श्री. ए. एस., सचिव, राजस्थान सरकार, खान,
बन और पर्यावरण विभाग” पढ़ा जाएगा।

[संख्या 154/रज./87]
प्रदेश से,
प्रार. पी. बहला. सचिव

New Delhi, the 5th March, 1987

CORRIGENDUM

O.N. 40.—In the Commission's Notification No. 154/RJ/87 dated the 23rd January, 1987, issued under section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950) the existing entry “Shri Dharam Singh Meena, IAS, Secretary to Government of Rajasthan, Mines, Labour, Forest and Environment Department” shall be corrected to read as “Shri Dharam Singh Meena, IAS, Secretary to Government of Rajasthan, Mines, Forests and Environment Department”.

[No. 154/RJ/87]

By Order,

R. P. BHALLA, Secy.